JOHN MILTON'S *AN APOLOGY, ETC.*—A CRITICAL EDITION

BY

MILFORD CYRIL JOCHUMS

A.B., University of Illinois, 1938

A.M., University of Illinois, 1940

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH
IN THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1948

URBANA, ILLINOIS

1948

JOHN MILTON'S *AN APOLOGY, ETC.*—A CRITICAL EDITION

BY

MILFORD CYRIL JOCHUMS

A.B., University of Illinois, 1938

A.M., University of Illinois, 1940

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH
IN THE GRADUATE COLLEGE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, 1948

URBANA, ILLINOIS

1948

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The debts one owes to others in a work of this kind are both considerable and inevitable. To the librarians of the University of Illinois, particularly to Miss Isabelle Grant and Miss Georgia Coffin of the Rare Book Room, to Miss Eva Faye Benton of the English Seminar, to Miss Helen Stewart of Circulation, and to Miss Alma DeJordy of the Acquisition Department, I express my appreciation for their patience, help, and encouragement. I am grateful for the aid given me by Drs. Marvin T. Herrick, Edwin Robbins, and Marian Harman in connection with the Latin and Greek passages in this study. I acknowledge with thanks the assistance which Dr. Marguerite Little gave me upon many occasions and the suggestions which she made for the improving of the work.

Throughout the preparation of this thesis my wife has been a true help meet.

It has been my privilege to prepare this edition under the direction of Professor Harris F. Fletcher whose criticisms, advice, and inspiration have been "my strength and my fortress."

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

JOHN MILTON'S *AN APOLOGY, ETC.*—A CRITICAL EDITION

John Milton's fifth and last anti-prelatical tract entitled *An Apology Against a Pamphlet Call'd A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus* has never before been edited and annotated as a separate work. Attention to it has usually been lightly textual for inclusion in collections of Milton's prose, restricted or complete. It is the purpose of this thesis to present a critical edition of the *Apology,* with introduction, critical facsimile text, and commentary.

The study of John Milton's *Apology* is, therefore, presented in three parts. Part One discusses the authorship and date of the pamphlet, provides the necessary background materials, shows the relationship of the tract to Milton's other anti-episcopal pamphlets as well as to those that make up the Smectymnuan controversy, and attempts a critical evaluation of the piece. Part Two is made up of a facsimile text of the original tract with textual notes and such variants and states as have been discovered. Part Three is composed of critical notes and commentary on the contents of the *Apology.*

Part One is divided into eight sections. Section I indicates that the *Apology,* originally issued anonymously, was undoubtedly written by John Milton. It further points out that the tract was published twice during Milton's lifetime. The first appearance was probably in April or May of 1642. The pamphlet was published and sold by John Rothwell, the bookseller-publisher, who probably had published Milton's fourth anti-prelatical pamphlet, *The Reason of Church-governement,* some months earlier. It seems quite probable that neither the *Reason of Church-governement* nor *An Apology* sold so well as had been anticipated, for when Milton's fame had become enhanced by his *Defence of the*

People of England and *Second Defence of the People of England,* Rothwell decided to make use of the copies of the *Reason of Church-governement* and the *Apology* that remained on his shelves by reissuing both pamphlets under a single new title page. The new title page read *An Apology for Smectymnuus. With the Reason of Church-Government. By John Milton, Gent.* Although the reissue title page was undated, evidence seems to point to the year 1654 as the reissue date.

Sections II and III point out the general outlines of the political and religious situation in England in 1642 and present a short account of the English presbyterianism of that time, which is more or less distinct from Scottish presbyterianism in its leanings toward congregationalism. The English presbyterians were inclined toward the following tenents:

1. That a governing church is no larger than a worshiping congregation;

2. That the authority of governing officers in the church cannot exceed the bounds of the worshiping congregation;

3. That all powers beyond those which are necessary to reform disorders in particular churches are vested in the civil magistrate;

4. That civil magistrates shall convene synods or assemblies of ministers the power of which can be only persuasive, not coercive.

The fact that the English pledge to accept Scotch presbyterianism by the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant on September 22, 1643, in order to gain Scotch aid against the English King failed to alter the fundamental differences between the two types of presbyterians is evidenced by the fact that the English as a people did not accept the Scottish variety with any enthusiasm or tolerate the system very long. Although Milton exhibited no doubts in 1641 that the only true, Scriptural method of church government was by

presbyters, he nevertheless set up reservations to the strict presbyterian position which point toward congregationalism, for he was not a Calvinist at heart. His tendencies, probably already begun, toward independency in politics and religion were not yet in evidence in 1642.

Section IV is taken up with the Smectymnuan controversy which was essentially a specialized aspect of the struggle between those who upheld the established form of church government which was episcopacy and those who sought to substitute presbyterianism for it. The Smectymnuan controversy began immediately after the appearance of Bishop Hall's anonymous *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Covrt of Parliament, By a dutifull Sonne of the Church* (January 1640/1) which inspired Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstowe, five presbyterian ministers writing under the pseudonym "Smectymnuus," thus giving inadvertently their name to the series of pamphlets, to take up the defence of the anti-prelatical position with *An Answer to a Book Entitvled, An Humble Remonstrance . . . . Written by Smectymnvvs* (March 1640/1). Hall was goaded by the Smectymnuan retort to write his anonymous *A Defence of The Humble Remonstrance . . . . By the Author of the said Humble Remonstrance* (April 1641), which was answered both by the Smectymnuan *A Vindication of the Ansvver to the Hvmble Remonstrance . . . . By The Same Smectymnvvs* (June 1641) and by John Milton's anonymous *Animadversions Upon The Remonstrants Defence, Against Smectymnvvs* (July 1641). Hall answered the Smectymnuan *Vindication* with the anonymous *A Short Answer to the Tedious Vindication of Smectymnvvs* (late July or early August 1641) in which he declared that he was quitting the controversy. Although the first six pamphlets in the Smectymnuan controversy had appeared within a period of six months, a half year more elapsed before the pamphlet *A Modest Confutation Of A Slanderous Libell, Entitvled, Animadversions Vpon The Remonstrants Defense Against Smectymnuus* (late January

or early February 1641/2) appeared anonymously in answer to Milton's *Animadversions.* The *Modest Confutation* became the occasion for Milton's writing of *An Apology Against a Pamphlet Call'd A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions upon the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus* (April or May 1642).

Although the *Apology* is listed as an anti-prelatical tract, the church interest seems to be secondary to Milton's vindication of himself against the charges of the author of *A Modest Confutation* who, drawing inferences from Milton's words and tone in the *Animadversions,* insists, among other things, that Milton spent his youth "loytering, bezelling, and Harlotting," that he was "vomited-out" the University, that he frequented the "Play-Houses, or the Bordelli," and that he blasphemed "God and the King, as ordinarily as erewhile he drank Sack or swore." Such charges, Milton felt, could not be allowed to go unchallenged for they were hurtful not only to him as a person but also to the truth of anti-episcopacy with which he had "incorporated" himself. Therefore, Milton welcomed the opportunity to reveal how wrong the author of the *Modest Confutation* was in every charge he had made.

Section V of the Introduction opens the problem of the authorship of the *Modest Confutation.* On the basis of Milton's statements in the *Apology* David Masson, in his *The Life of John Milton,* assumed that the work was written by Bishop Joseph Hall and his oldest son, the Rev. Robert Hall. A careful consideration of the evidence in the *Apology* seems to indicate that Milton thought he saw Joseph Hall's hand in parts of the work, but that he attributed other parts as definitely to Hall's son, for Milton is usually very careful to distinguish Hall, the Remonstrant, from his son, the Confuter. From a study of the various allusions to the Confuter the feeling grows that Milton thought of the Confuter as a young scholar, recently graduated B. A., still at the University, a scholar who had taken orders and had a living, who was

teaching freshmen, and who was a true product of scholasticism. In the *Modest Confutation* in response to Milton's demands that the "Bishopricks and Deanaries" "to encourage young scholars in their Studies" should be taken away, the Confuter answered that he was one of those young scholars. If the Confuter meant, as he seems to mean, that he has had the encouragement of a "Bishoprick or Deanarie" that Confuter can be neither Bishop Joseph Hall nor his son Robert, for both had been *pensioners* at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The Bishop's second son, Joseph, appears to have been a layman and to be disqualified. The third son, George, is ineligible for he was a *commoner* at Exeter College, Oxford. Of Hall's three younger sons, Samuel, John, and Edward, the youngest son, Edward, appears most nearly to fit Milton's description. Edward probably took his B. A. in 1640 at Oxford, had a fellowship until his death on December 24, 1642, and apparently held the position of "Artium Professor" at Oxford. Milton spends much of his time and vents much of his anger in repaying the Confuter for his bold charges against Milton. Milton's anger at having been accused of frequenting the Bordelloes and of seeking a "rich Widow" seems to demand the annihilation of the Confuter. Milton taunts him with such terms as "rude Scavinger," "cursing Shimei," "Sophister," "obscure thorn-eater of malice and detraction," "lozel Bachelor of Art," "matriculated confutant," "cloister'd Lubber," and "inraged . . . hypocrite." Milton points out that the Confuter uses "foolish language," is a "tormentor of semi-colons," borrows "word for word," and "demeanes himself in . . . dull expression." Milton, in his studied intent to belittle the Confuter, seems to follow him even into the digression eulogizing Parliament where the Confuter is by inference denied all the excellences attributed to the members of Parliament. Much of the bitterness of the *Apology* is, therefore, pointed directly at the one who had attacked Milton's virtue. It is quite probable that few outside the Hall family realized the full force of Milton's viciousness. One might conjecture whether, upon Edward

Hall's death three-quarters of a year after Milton's attack, Bishop Hall or someone else may not have withdrawn copies of the *Modest Confutation* from circulation out of deference to the memory of the son, reasoning that the withdrawl of the unfortunate issue would leave much of Milton's *Apology* rather pointless and rather egotistical, for the fact remains that original copies of the *Modest Confutation* are, in Masson's words, "extremely scarce."

Section VI turns to Milton's other anti-episcopal tracts in order to determine what Milton was thinking and saying in 1641 and early 1642 about the reasons for his participation in the anti-episcopal controversy, about the universities, about his plans for an epic, as well as about the liturgy, the prelates, episcopacy, presbyterians, Godly ministers, the political-religious struggle in England, and the Parliament.

Section VII considers the *Apology,* particularly the autobiographical aspects. Milton, in looking back upon the anti-prelatical conflict in the *Second Defence of the English People* preferred to emphasize that the *Apology* had been an attack upon a "bishop of reputation" and to minimize what seems to be the truth, namely, that the *Apology* is largely concerned with Milton's vindication of his own reputation against the charges of a rather insignificant Confuter. Milton's emphasis does not alter the fact that the *Apology* was much less concerned with the church question than with personal aspects of the controversy. Milton's tone and sureness of touch in the *Apology* point toward his recognition of the entirely successful nature of his preceding pamphlets and toward his satisfaction with the reception and attention given them. It is, no doubt, the adulation heaped upon him by the almost fanatical presbyterian group with whom Milton had allied himself and the success with which his anti-prelatical efforts had been crowned that caused him to throw himself into the fray with the blind zeal that he exhibits in the *Apology.* He, the defender of the truth, must vindicate his name from the extravagant charges of the Confuter lest the

cause suffer. Consequently, he devotes much time to an account of his youth, his study habits, his mental and spiritual growth.

Section VIII points out that the chief value of the *Apology* to the student of today lies in the autobiographical passages which are, perhaps, second to none as a record of the successive phases of Milton's life, covering a period of about seventeen years, from his entry into Christ College in the spring of 1625 to the writing of the *Apology* in the spring of 1642. The surety of Milton's touch in the account of himself in the *Apology* springs from his self-assurance that he is a good man, and the champion of truth. He is elated with the opportunity of attacking such men of learning as Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Hall, so elated that he constantly reminds his reader not only of the "blunted fame of his elder adversary" but also of his own youth and "small repute." Milton herein evinces a considerable opinion of himself as a controversialist. The charges of the Confuter, if unchallenged, will be detrimental to his position and to his cause. Partially for that reason he writes *An Apology* with a fervor and frenzy bent toward the justification of himself and the complete discrediting of his opponents, particularly Hall and his son. Milton regularly and conventionally resorts not only to disgraceful and scandalous references in his attempt to vindicate himself, but to the well-known medium of self-exaltation. He welcomes the opportunity of proving that by nature he had a "reserv'dnesse of natural disposition, and morall discipline" that, exclusive of his Christian training, guided him unerringly toward the highest goals. Because Milton's focal point is the establishment of his virtue with such finality that any charges against him will be incredible, and that those who make the charges will seem the more insignificant for having made them, he turns to a revelation of his inmost thoughts to show the sort of "irresistible grace" that has impelled him constantly toward the highest values, and at the same time away from "those low descents of mind" to which one must descend before he "can agree to salable and unlawful pros-

titutions." Having once established his character upon bases that seem to him unassailable, he proceeds to discuss with some authority a number of the church problems which the Confuter raised.

The very vehemence of Milton's objections to the Confuter's charges that Milton had frequented the Bordelloes and that he was searching for a "rich Widow" may indicate that those charges touched nearer home than we know. His own declarations have pretty much made people in the seventeenth century and thereafter forget that the "rich Widow" may have been a real widow, and that, according to Edward Phillips, Milton would occasionally "so far make bold with his Body, as now and then to keep a Gawdy-day." Since the London of Milton's day was a rather small world it is quite possible that Milton was better known than the few allusions to him that are extant seem to indicate. By virtue of his anti-episcopal tracts he may have made a name for himself among a considerable, though a rather inarticulate, group. That Milton is particularly proud of his *Animadversions* is evidenced by his frequent reference to it in the *Apology*. That Milton writes *An Apology* to maintain his pamphleteering leadership seems to be obvious. One must, therefore, remember that the pamphlet is written for an audience of friends, against those who would detract from Milton's leadership. Milton's plea is a partisan one for a partisan group. Milton, like other controversialists of the time, uses, therefore, every resource at his disposal from the exaltation of himself to the consummate degradation of his opponent in order to maintain his position. The biographical passages in *An Apology,* no doubt, are very valuable to the student of Milton, but they must be accepted with some reservations for they are propaganda. That the propaganda is based on actual experience is quite possible; that it is a precise and accurate record of Milton's experience is improbable. The very orderliness of the development of Milton's inner thought as portrayed in the *Apology* should make one wary. Such orderliness is, quite often, the result of retrospective rationalization.

Part Two presents an actual size facsimile text of the 1642 *Apology* together with the variants in text that have been discovered and textual notes. All reproductions are photographic with the exception of Page 8, State One, which is photostatic. The textual observations and notes are based on the direct collation of six original copies, one photostatic facsimile copy, and eleven film copies. Variations observed in films have been compared carefully with actual copies in order to make certain that the evidence seen there is not the results of spots or marks on the paper, or of show-through from the opposite side of the sheet. Of the six actual copies used, five have title pages dated "1642"; the other which is in no significant way different from the others in text, is bound with the reissue title page, which is undated.

Signature A of the *Apology* seems to appear in three states, Signatures B and D in two, Signatures C, E, F, and G in one, and Signature H in at least two. The word "state" as used here indicates that type has been intentionally reset. When the variants appeared in the text separate photographs were reproduced. When the variant was in signature or page number the variant was simply noted in the textual notes.

Part Three consists of critical notes and commentary which it is anticipated will be valuable to the student of John Milton's *Apology*. Comment has been made upon every word, phrase, sentence, or idea, which offered a hindrance to the understanding or appreciation of the tract. All references to the *Apology* are made by page and line to the facsimile text. For the convenience of the Milton student, a conversion chart to the *Apology* in *The Works of John Milton* (Frank Allen Patterson, General Editor), New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-1938, 18 vols., Volume III, is provided in the appendix.

The critical notes fall into the following more or less inclusive categories:

1. Identification of quotations, citations, and allusions.

2. Complete quotation of statements in the *Modest Confutation* to which Milton replies.
3. Tracing of pertinent ideas through the Smectymnuan tracts to their conclusion in the *Apology*.
4. References to and quotations from the works of Milton as well as those of contemporary writers to elucidate or clarify Milton's statements.
5. Explanation of words used in specialized senses or with literal Latin emphasis, as well as comments upon unusual spellings.
6. Biographical sketches.
7. Explanation of references to astrology and medicine.
8. Analysis of Milton's arguments together with some comment on dialectic terms.
9. Clarification of syntactical difficulties.
10. Bibliographical information.

VITA

Milford Cyril Jochums was born to George and Lena Lohr Jochums, February 23, 1912, near Minonk, Illinois. After attending Illinois public schools he studied at Illinois Wesleyan University, Wheaton College, and the University of Illinois. From the last he took a B. A. degree in 1938, and an M. A. in 1940. During the years 1933-1936 and 1938-1940 he taught in the public schools of Illinois. During the years 1940-1942 and 1946-1948 he served on the faculty of the English Department of the University of Illinois as an Assistant in English. In May of 1942 he was married to Alice Marguerite Egly, and in September of the same year inducted into the Army of the United States, from which he was discharged in September 1946. He has one son, Arnold Milford, born April 28, 1946.